<u>REMARKS</u>

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 25, 2006. Claims 1, 4 -8, 11-15 and 18-22 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 8, and 15 are in independent form. Claims 1, 4 -8, 11-15 and 18-21 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 15, 16 and 23-26 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and will not be mentioned further. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15, 18, 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 5,838,319 (Guzak) in view of U.S. Patent 6,452,692 (Yacoub). In addition, Claims 9 and 16 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious from *Guzak* in view of *Yacoub* and U.S. Patent 5,895,474 (Maarek et al.), Claims 5, 10, 12, 17 and 19, as being obvious from *Guzak* in view of *Yacoub* and U.S. Patent 6,003,040 (Mital et al.), and Claims 7, 14 and 21, as being obvious from *Guzak* in view of *Yacoub*.

From the Office Action, Applicant understands that the Examiner agrees with Applicant that *Guzak* does not suggest the claimed manner of display, but now believes that *Yacoub* teaches permitting display of a specific detected object, in accordance with a tree list, in a manner based on the number of steps along a directory path from a local object corresponding to a locally-connected peripheral, to the specific object that is not locally connected.

Applicant submits, however, that nothing in *Yacoub* is seen to provide such a suggestion, and it does not appear that *Yacoub* is concerned to any significant degree with a display at all, but rather is concerned entirely with logic for determining to which of

several printers a given job should be sent. Even if the prior-art arrangement discussed in

Yacoub (see Fig. 1) contemplates the user being asked to intervene if there is a fault at the

selected printer, the stated intention of *Yacoub* is to reduce to a minimum the user's

involvement once the print job has been set up and printing has been instructed to be

performed (col. 3, line 49, through col. 4, line 26).

   Moreover, even the portions of *Yacoub* specifically cited by the Examiner

do not appear to have anything to do with a display or UI of any kind. The Office Action

asserts that

> "Yacoub *expressly teaches* permitting said display means to display, in
> accordance with the tree list, the specific object detected by said detection
> means (Column 14 lines 62-67), in a manner based on the number of steps
> along a directory path leading from a local object corresponding to one of the
> peripheral devices locally connected to said information processing apparatus
> to the specific object corresponding to another specific peripheral device not
> locally connected to said information processing apparatus (Column 9 lines
> 17-33, Column 11 lines 7-26) [emphasis added]",

The basis for this assertion is not understood clearly.   The cited passages (col. 9, lines 17-

33, 11, lines 7-26, and col. 14, lines 62-67) describe an exemplary office suite containing a

number of printers and PCs (Fig. 4), and the processing performed by the server to identify

the physically closest printer to the user; all of these passages are silent as to any display

being performed, and certainly do not, as far as Applicant can see, teach any such features

as alleged by the Office Action.

   It is therefore submitted that the interpretation of *Yacoub* set out in the

Office Action is inaccurate, and that since all of the outstanding prior-art rejections are

based partially on that patent, those rejections should be withdrawn.

Nonetheless, as shown above, the independent claims have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention, and it is believed that the new claim language renders the independent claims even more clearly allowable over the art applied against them.

For example, independent Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus that is capable of communicating with a plurality of peripheral devices, and that comprises a storage device, display means, detection means and control means. The is for storing predetermined objects for the peripheral devices based on directory information, and the detection means is for detecting specific objects in the directory information read from the storage device, the specific objects including at least a first specific object corresponding to a first one of the plurality of peripheral devices and a second specific object corresponding to a second one of the plurality of peripheral devices. The display means are for displaying, in accordance with a tree list, the specific objects detected by the detection means, and the control means for permit the display means to display, in accordance with the tree list, the specific objects detected by the detection means, *such that the first specific object is displayed in preference to the second specific object* if the number of other information processing apparatuses which exist between the first peripheral device and the information processing apparatus is smaller than the number of other information processing apparatuses which exist between the second peripheral device and the information processing apparatus.

Thus, among other notable features of Claim 1, the control means permits the display means to display the detected specific objects in accordance with the tree list such that the first specific object is displayed in preference to the second specific object, if

the number of other information processing apparatuses which exists between the first peripheral device and the information processing apparatus is smaller than the number of other information processing apparatuses which exist between the second peripheral device and the information processing apparatus. This feature is not found in the cited art.

Independent Claims 8 and 15 are method and computer memory medium claims, respectively corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. In addition, however, Claim 5, dependent from Claim 1, further recites that when one of the specific objects can not be referred to directly due to access right limitations, the control means does not permit the display means to display the one specific object. This feature is not found in the cited art. A similar recitation is found in Claims 12 and 19 .

In any event, since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 582653v1